

**REMARKS****1. The objection to the drawings**

The drawings have been objected to for the quality of Figure 1 as set forth on page 3 of the office action. Applicants concurrently submit a replacement sheet of Figure 1. Applicants respectfully request this objection be withdrawn.

**2. The objection to the specification**

The specification has been objected to for the phrase “in vivo” at page 152, line 7 as set forth on page 4 of the office action. Applicants have amended the specification to correct the phrase to “in vitro.” Support for the amendments can be found at page 152, lines 4-17 of the specification originally filed. Applicants respectfully request this objection be withdrawn.

**3. The objection to the claims**

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 18, 19, 21 and 22 have been objected to for allegedly reciting non-elected formulae or compounds as well as informalities as set forth on page 4 of the office action. Applicants have amended these claims by deleting the non-elected formulae and correcting the informalities. Applicants respectfully request this objection be withdrawn.

**4. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10-12, 18 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly fails to enable the full scope of the claimed invention. Claims 2, 13, 19 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly fails to enable the full scope of the claimed invention.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 2 to recite a method of inhibiting hyperproliferative cell growth and activity of p56<sup>lek</sup> molecule respectively to better capture the envisioned commercial embodiments and to remove the non-elected species. Support for the amendments can be found in the original claims and original specification, for example, at pages 149-152. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification fully enables the full scope of the

currently amended claims. First, the claims have been amended to better reflect the envisioned commercial embodiments of using compounds encompassed by formula I that are useful in inhibiting hyperproliferative cell growth and p56<sup>Lck</sup> activity. As acknowledged by the Office Action at page 11-12, the specification provides sufficient experimental guidance for *in vivo* and *in vitro* assays of representative compounds 73 and 276. The assays described in the specification identified 13 compounds, including compounds 73 and 276, with high Lck inhibition activities (see Figure 2 and page 152 of the specification). Applicants assert that amended claims 1 and 2 are commensurate in scope with the experimental examples provided in the specification that show inhibiting activities in the cellular functional assay. The exemplary guidance provided in the specification shows these compounds' inhibitive effect on hyperproliferative cell growth and p56<sup>Lck</sup> activity. Since the specification discloses at least one method of using compounds 73 and 276, both of which bear a reasonable correlation to the entire scope of amended claims, a skilled artisan would not be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the claimed methods with the experimental guidance provided in the specification. *See In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA, 1970). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

### **5. Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and enablement rejection. Should the Examiner find that an interview would be helpful to further prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at his convenience.

Date: <b>April 29, 2011</b>	By:	<u>/Todd B. Buck/</u>
Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP		Todd B. Buck, Ph.D.
Customer No. <b>09629</b>		Registration No. 48,574
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.		Tel. No.: (202) 739-5698
Washington, D.C. 20004		Fax No.: (202) 739-3001
Tel. No.: 202-739-3000		